

Communities of Opportunity

Interim Governance Group

Meeting Notes

April 27, 2015

Members Present: Michael Brown, Deanna Dawson, Hilary Franz, Patty Hayes, Betsy Jones, Paola Maranan, Gordon McHenry, Jeff Natter, Sili Savusa, Adam Taylor, Tony To, Michael Woo

Staff Present: Kirsten Wysen, Alice Ito, Aaron Robertson, A.J. McClure, Nadine Chan, Holly Rohr Tran

Welcome and introductions

Kirsten Wysen welcomed the group and led a round of introductions.

Governance

Timing of transition to ongoing Governance Group

The group discussed a proposal put forth at the March 9 Interim Governance Group (IGG) meeting to keep the current group of IGG members, add representatives from the three sites and do a gap analysis with the three sites' priority strategies to see if adding a Governance Group member or providing technical assistance could best advance the strategies.

- *Members agreed that this group should remain interim through the summer, transitioning to an ongoing Governance Group in fall of 2015. In addition to using input regarding membership from 3 co-design sites, it was noted that the 2 planning sites should also be given opportunity to provide input.*

Site representatives

It was proposed that the three sites (White Center, Rainier Valley and SeaTac/Tukwila) add one person to the IGG, with the option of having one person for 12 months and then rotating, or rotating more frequently and taking on the task of keeping representatives up to date.

Group discussion included:

- Good to rotate site representative on an annual basis – balance diversity and stability
 - No restrictions on bringing others to meetings as listeners in the interest of succession planning and relationship-building; however, each site gets only one “vote”
 - Helpful to have a real-time roster, so that members can understand who's at the table
 - When place-based sites grow to more than 3, revisit the discussion of having 3 site representatives.
 - Need to continue the conversation in the future about the role, structure, and goals of this table – need to keep membership small enough for the group to be effective, while ensuring effective representation.
- *Members agreed to add 3 site representatives to the IGG.*

Members discussed whether there are current gaps that could be filled either by a new Governance Group member or by technical assistance to the three sites:

- Municipalities (including the City of Seattle) – try to help them understand communities better by including them in this work
- Caution about expanding group too large during this year of evolutionary growth; preserve the flexibility to experiment
- Consider out-of-the-box representatives or approaches like linking to community tables

Living Cities Implementation Proposal

Kirsten Wyses, Cheryl Markham and Nadine Chan are leading the work on drafting an implementation proposal for Communities of Opportunity (COO), due to Living Cities on May 1. Prior to the meeting, members had been emailed the draft proposal narrative, draft framework, and a Memorandum of Understanding. Kirsten noted that if there are comments in addition to today's discussion, email them before Friday, May 1.

Results, indicators and strategies overview.

This "Framework" spreadsheet uses the results and indicators developed with the Results Based Accountability consultant in late March and proposals from the 3 sites. It is changeable and represents a moment in time for COO in order to submit the Living Cities Integration Initiative implementation proposal. Sites can overlap on some strategies, and don't need to work on all strategies. The IGG will investigate and act on bigger picture policy and systems change strategies to complement the sites' work.

Kirsten asked the group to review the 8 strategies and provide feedback, which included:

- Strategies that are cross-cutting or accomplish more than one of these should automatically be prioritized
- OK to release this point-in-time framework to Living Cities for purposes of meeting submission deadline; preserve the flexibility to build in more along the way
- Revisit/refine further before releasing to others beyond Living Cities
- This document serves a narrow purpose and does not well explain: the connection to the larger picture of the "how" this work is getting done; the innovative partnership between government, private sector and philanthropy; and the relationship to other transformational efforts underway.

Memorandum of Understanding overview and discussion

Members were presented with the Memorandum of Understanding for Communities of Opportunity Interim Governance Group members and asked if they had any suggested revisions before signing. In addition to minor grammar and formatting edits, the phrase "health, social, economic and racial" was inserted before the word "equity" for clarity.

Members signed on their own behalf and in their capacity as a member of the Interim Governance Group; it is acknowledged that they are not committing the entities they represent to this Agreement, but that it represents the work they do on the IGG for Communities of Opportunity.

It was noted that when discussing supporting strategies (listed in the MOU) beyond the purpose of this particular document, some additional framing and messaging work should lift up COO's goal of improving the lived experience of those who experience chronic toxic stress which impacts well-being and productivity. The grant writers will also note this issue in the narrative of the proposal.

Communities of Opportunity spending plan for 2015

Aaron Robertson presented members with a spending plan. Member discussion included:

- We don't yet have a sense whether the 3 current place-based sites are adequately funded to do the work they set out to do
- Budget for co-design work will be refined later this spring (awards may have potential to increase, but will not decrease)
- As sites start planning for long-term sustainability, look for opportunities that COO funds can help leverage other funding opportunities
- This group needs to have a conversation before this fall to talk about investment strategy for potential new revenues and accompanying measurements

Options for additional funders.

It was proposed that funders have two options for contributing to COO: pooling funding or aligning funding. Examples of pooled funding include the King County Catalyst Fund and the Satterberg Foundation contributions to both policy and systems change and place-based grants. Examples of aligned funding include Partnerships Improving Community Health obesity/tobacco work and Community Development Block Grants.

- *Members approved offering funders 2 options (pooled or aligned funding) to contribute to COO.*

Proposed Learning Community on Community Engagement from the Harwood Institute for fall 2015.

Members reviewed a proposal and discussed:

- High cost – is the value our community receives commensurate with the price?
- Have we scanned for local talent that could accomplish these outcomes? Let's not overlook expertise and relationships in our own communities
- In the interest of sustainability, would like to build on current community capacity to do community engagement by pulling in someone with national experience
- Several IGG members had the opportunity to meet Harwood folks at the last Living Cities Learning Community in Washington, DC.
- Electeds have identified community engagement as one of their top needs; perhaps an indicator that there is a gap in our communities that could benefit from some national inspiration

- A national facilitator could take local preference/baggage out of the question for attendees; Harwood has a broad spectrum of experience (electeds and grassroots); Harwood could help present COO site leads as “local experts” to local electeds
 - Focus invites in areas we’re not currently reaching (e.g. elected, non-profit housing development) to help move the cross-sector idea (e.g., electeds)
 - Need to see more about Harwood’s analysis on race
 - Check whether their model has been tested in diverse situations, as we have in our communities
 - Need to define audience to ensure effective approach - policy makers or community? Can’t reach both with same approach.
 - Thinking about next iteration of the gov. group – how do we ensure that we shape policy and systems in a way that will make a better future? If we don’t utilize national talent when it’s appropriate to do so, how do our 3 sites do the hard work of CE without some support?
- *Staff will send a link to Harwood’s website to the IGG for further reading and conduct more research on race analysis and the method’s diversity compatibility, perform reference check and develop a proposal for who would be invited to a Fall 2015 convening. The IGG can use this to make an informed decision on May 22.*

Updates

Kirsten is working with Living Cities to have an opportunity for all IGG members to attend the June 23-24 Learning Community in Chicago. Stay tuned for more details.

On Thursday, April 30, Kirsten is participating in a Living Cities webinar about racial equity and community engagement – she will share materials with the IGG when available.

A request was made that if there are funding opportunities from King County that COO sites can apply for, please let them know.

Next meetings:

- Fri, May 22, Seattle Foundation, 1200 5th Ave, Seattle
- June 23-24, Chicago Living Cities Learning Community meeting
- Wed, July 29, at one of the sites
- Wed, Sept 30, at one of the sites
- Oct 13-14, Dallas Living Cities Learning Community meeting
- Mon, Nov 30, at one of the sites